

The Plan Library is live!

[See proposed plans from across the country.](#)



NY-MC-03-12-31-2021.json

State

New York

Legislative

U.S. House


Added to PlanScore

Dec. 31, 2021

PlanScore bases its scores on predicted precinct-level votes for each office (State House, State Senate, and U.S. House) built from past election results and U.S. Census data. [More information about the predictive model used to score this plan.](#)

Charts and Graphs

Efficiency Gap: 2.1% R




+25% D Balanced +25% R

The Plan Library is live!


Votes for Republican candidates are expected to be inefficient at a rate 2.1% R lower than votes for Democratic candidates, favoring Republicans in 65% of predicted scenarios. * [Learn more](#) >

Sensitivity Testing



Sensitivity testing shows us a plan’s expected efficiency gap given a range of possible vote swings. It lets us evaluate the durability of a plan’s skew.

Declination: 0.17 R



The difference between mean Democratic vote share in Democratic districts and mean Republican vote share in Republican districts along with the relative fraction of seats won by each party leads to a declination that favors Republicans in 86% of predicted scenarios. * [Learn more](#) >


Partisan Bias

The parties’ statewide vote shares are 61.4% (Democratic) and 38.6% (Republican) based on the model. Partisan bias is shown only where the parties’ statewide vote shares fall between 45% and 55%. Outside this range the metric’s assumptions are not plausible.

Mean-Median Difference

The parties' statewide vote shares are 61.4% (Democratic) and 38.6% (Republican) based on the model. **The Plan Library is live!** mean-median difference is shown only where the parties' statewide vote shares fall between 45% and 55%. [See proposed plans from across the country.](#) Outside this range the metric's assumptions are not plausible.

District Map



District Data

| District | Candidate Scenario | Pop. 2020 | Hispanic CVAP 2019 | Non-Hisp. Black CVAP 2019 | Non-Hisp. Asian CVAP 2019 | Non-Hisp. Native CVAP 2019 | Chance of 1+ Flips [†] | Chance of Democratic Win | Predicted Vote Shares |
|----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Open Seat | 775,709 | 12.6% | 6.6% | 3.2% | 0.3% | Yes | 35% | 48% D / 52% R |
| 2 | Open Seat | 775,881 | 12.9% | 8.0% | 3.4% | 0.3% | Yes | 35% | 48% D / 52% R |
| 3 | Open Seat | 776,134 | 10.6% | 8.5% | 7.1% | 0.2% | Yes | 51% | 50% D / 50% R |
| 4 | Open Seat | 776,076 | 13.1% | 11.1% | 17.4% | 0.3% | No | 94% | 57% D / 43% R |
| 5 | Open Seat | 774,935 | 17.2% | 51.1% | 13.5% | 0.6% | No | >99% | 78% D / 22% R |

The Plan Library is live!

See proposed plans from across the state.

| District | Candidate Scenario | Pop. 2020 | Hispanic CVAP 2019 | Black CVAP 2019 | Non-Hisp. Asian CVAP 2019 | Non-Hisp. Native CVAP 2019 | Chance of 1+ Flips [†] | Chance of Democratic Win | Predicted Vote Shares |
|----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| 9 | Open Seat | 774,876 | 10.5% | 47.2% | 7.4% | 0.3% | No | >99% | 78% D / 22% R |
| 10 | Open Seat | 776,027 | 12.0% | 8.6% | 12.8% | 0.3% | No | >99% | 73% D / 27% R |
| 11 | Open Seat | 775,815 | 14.1% | 7.1% | 15.5% | 0.3% | Yes | 14% | 45% D / 55% R |
| 12 | Open Seat | 776,469 | 10.8% | 4.3% | 11.7% | 0.3% | No | >99% | 82% D / 18% R |
| 13 | Open Seat | 773,947 | 50.1% | 25.9% | 4.1% | 0.2% | No | >99% | 84% D / 16% R |
| 14 | Open Seat | 775,469 | 41.3% | 21.8% | 10.2% | 0.3% | No | >99% | 75% D / 25% R |
| 15 | Open Seat | 774,232 | 56.6% | 32.5% | 3.2% | 0.4% | No | >99% | 82% D / 18% R |
| 16 | Open Seat | 775,684 | 19.6% | 22.9% | 5.4% | 0.3% | No | >99% | 69% D / 31% R |
| 17 | Open Seat | 778,449 | 12.5% | 9.1% | 5.0% | 0.3% | Yes | 82% | 54% D / 46% R |
| 18 | Open Seat | 782,178 | 12.7% | 10.3% | 2.5% | 0.5% | Yes | 51% | 50% D / 50% R |
| 19 | Open Seat | 778,966 | 4.2% | 5.1% | 1.7% | 0.6% | Yes | 55% | 51% D / 49% R |
| 20 | Open Seat | 778,172 | 4.5% | 7.7% | 2.6% | 0.4% | Yes | 58% | 51% D / 49% R |
| 21 | Open Seat | 785,764 | 2.9% | 3.3% | 1.1% | 1.1% | Yes | 22% | 46% D / 54% R |
| 22 | Open Seat | 778,311 | 2.8% | 3.7% | 2.2% | 0.6% | Yes | 26% | 47% D / 53% R |
| 23 | Open Seat | 782,534 | 2.9% | 3.2% | 1.7% | 1.0% | Yes | 24% | 47% D / 53% R |
| 24 | Open Seat | 776,147 | 3.2% | 6.9% | 1.5% | 0.9% | Yes | 48% | 50% D / 50% R |
| 25 | Open Seat | 775,652 | 6.5% | 14.0% | 1.3% | 0.8% | Yes | 52% | 50% D / 50% R |
| 26 | Open Seat | 774,610 | 5.2% | 15.2% | 2.4% | 0.6% | No | 97% | 59% D / 41% R |

The Plan Library is live!

Predicted 71% D / 29% R seat share across scenarios* vs. 61% D / 39% R vote share.

[See proposed plans from across the country.](#)

[Download raw data as tab-delimited text.](#)

| Metric | Value | Favors Democrats in this % of Scenarios* | More Skewed than this % of Historical Plans‡ | More Pro-Democratic than this % of Historical Plans‡ |
|---|---------------------|--|--|--|
| <u>Efficiency Gap</u> | 2.1% Pro-Republican | 35% | 20% | 34% |
| <u>Declination</u> | 0.17 Pro-Republican | 14% | 58% | 26% |
| <u>Partisan Bias</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| <u>Mean- Median Difference</u> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Freedom to Vote Act Races

[Section 5003\(c\)\(3\) of the FTVA](#) specifies that partisan fairness should be assessed using a state's two most recent elections for U.S. President and two most recent elections for U.S. Senate.

U.S. President 2020: 3.5% D

Under this plan, votes for the Democratic candidate were inefficient at a rate 3.5% D lower than votes for the Republican candidate.

U.S. President 2016: 15.8% R

Under this plan, votes for the Republican candidate were inefficient at a rate 15.8% R lower than votes for the Democratic candidate.

U.S. Senate 2018: 16.0% D

Under this plan, votes for the Democratic candidate were inefficient at a rate 16.0% D lower than votes for the Republican candidate.

U.S. Senate 2016: 5.6% D

Under this plan, votes for the Democratic candidate were inefficient at a rate 5.6% D lower than votes for the Republican candidate.

* Scenarios are part of [the predictive model used to score this plan](#).

The Plan Library is live!

† 50%+ chance of one or more party flips assuming the plan is used for one decade with five State [See proposed plans from across the country](#).

House elections, five U.S. House elections, or three State Senate elections.

‡ Enacted [U.S. House](#), [State House](#), and [State Senate](#) plan metrics are featured in our [historical dataset](#).



PlanScore is a project of Campaign Legal Center.

